UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD DIVISION OF JUDGES

KELLER CONSTRUCTION, INC.

and Case 14-CA-122352

SCOTT WILLIAM HAMMOCK, An Individual

LABORERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, LOCAL 397 (Keller Construction, Inc.)

and Case 14-CB-116188

SCOTT WILLIAM HAMMOCK, An Individual

Rochelle K. Balentine and Lynn Zuch, Esqs.,
for the General Counsel.

David J. Gerber, Esq. (Keller Construction, Inc., Glen Carbon, Illinois)
for Respondent Keller Construction.

Daniel M. McLaughlin, Esq. (Spector, Wolfe, McLaughlin & O'Mara, LLC.,
Kirkwood, Missouri,
for Respondent LIUNA Local 397.

DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Arthur J. Amchan, Administrative Law Judge. This case was tried in St. Louis, Missouri, on April 15-16, 2014. The Charging Party, William Scott Hammock (hereinafter Scott Hammock), filed charge 14-CA-116188 against Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA) Local 397 on November 1, 2013 and an amended charge in this case on February 19, 2014. He filed charge 14-CA-122352 against Keller Construction, Inc. on February 11, 2014. The General Counsel issued a consolidated complaint on February 27, 2014.

The General Counsel alleges that on or about August 13, 2013, Respondent LIUNA Local 397 requested that Keller Construction lay off the Charging Party William Scott Hammock because Hammock engaged in dissident union activity. Hammock ran for vice-president of Local 397 against the incumbent William Trayler on June 13, 2013 and lost. On August 13, Keller permanently laid Hammock off after he had worked continuously (when there was work) for it since about 2002. The General Counsel alleges that the Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) and 8(b)(2) in seeking and causing Keller to lay-off Hammock. The General Counsel alleges that Keller violated Section 8(a)(3) and (1) in terminating Hammock's employment. The General Counsel seeks an order holding Keller Construction and Local 397 jointly and severally liable for any loss of earnings or other benefits as a result of the lay-off, as well as requiring Keller to reinstate Scott Hammock.

The General Counsel also alleges that on or about September 30, 2013, Respondent
Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) and 8(b) (2) in refusing to refer Hammock to GRP
Mechanical, an employer which requested permission to send Hammock to Oklahoma for work.

On the entire record,¹ including my observation of the demeanor of the witnesses, and after considering the briefs filed by the General Counsel, Keller Construction and Local 397, I make the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. JURISDICTION

25

30

35

20

5

10

Keller Construction, Inc. performs a variety of construction tasks in the State of Illinois. Its principal place of business is in Glen Carbon, Illinois. Keller purchases and receives goods valued in excess of \$50,000 from outside of Illinois at its Illinois facilities. Keller admits, and I find, that it is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act. All parties agree that the Union, LIUNA Local 397 is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

GRP Mechanical Company has offices in Bethalto, Illinois and performs work in Illinois, Kansas and Oklahoma. In the period ending January 31, 2014, GRP performed services valued in excess of \$50,000 outside of Illinois. GRP is also an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act.

II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

The Charging Party, Scott Hammock, was the recording secretary, of LIUNA Local 179 from about 1993 to about 2002 or 2003. In 2002 or 2003 he was defeated in an election for that office by William Traylor, now vice-president and field representative of Local 397. In about 2004 or 2005, Local 179 merged with Local 397.

¹ Tr. 208, line 12 incorrectly renders the name of Carey Carveiro as Carey Caldieraro .

Tr. 328, line 18-19: the word "about" is omitted.

In the spring of 2013, one of Hammock's brother-in-laws, Mike Jones, decided to run against the incumbent business manager of Local 397, Steve Tyler. Scott Hammock ran on Jones' "ticket" against the union's vice-president William Traylor. The Tyler-Traylor "ticket" won the election on June 13, 2013 by a margin of about 75% to 25%.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

On July 5, 2013, Donna Hammock, a member of Local 397, who is also Scott's wife and the sister of Mike Jones, sent a 16-page handwritten letter to the International Union in Washington. This letter complained bitterly about what Ms. Hammock considered to be unfair treatment by Local 397 and specifically by Tyler and Traylor. This letter was received by the International on July 9 and referred to Local 397 and a Regional LIUNA Office on July 22.

Scott Hammock was one of a number of "key employees" of Keller Construction. That means that when a job he was on finished, he was not sent back to the union hall. He was either sent to another Keller job or waited for Keller to get work for him. Although he sometimes did not have work, he worked a number of winters when other Local 397 members did not.

On August 13, 2013, Hammock was working for Keller at the American Steel project. After lunch that day, the Keller foreman at American Steel informed Hammock that he was being permanently laid off. Hammock had worked for Keller Construction continuously since 2002. He had never been laid off and sent back to the union's hiring hall previously. When Hammock signed the union's referral list at the union hall on August 16, it was the first time he had done so since 2002.

A number of Keller employees continued working regularly for Keller after Scott Hammock was laid off, Exh. G.C. 6. For example, Hammock worked 72 regular hours for Keller in August. Michael Cerentano worked 144 regular hours; Johnny Cox 152; Jason Govreau 152; Matt Troeckler 131; Alex Naylor 112; Timothy Moody 144; David May 144; Kirk Maedge 132. In September 2013 Cerentano worked 128 regular hours for Keller; Cox 128, Govreau 128, Kenny Jones (another of Hammock's brother-in-laws) 136, Kirk Maedge 140; David May 128; Timothy Moody, 136; Alex Naylor 136 and Matt Troeckler 126. A number of these employees performed the same type of work that Scott Hammock performed. Among these are Mike Cerentano, Tim Moody and Alex Naylor. None of these three were a "key employee" of Keller, but instead were referred to Keller from Local 397's hiring hall.²

A number of Keller employees worked a significant number of hours through the end of December 2013. There is absolutely no credible evidence as to why Scott Hammock was laid off on August 13 or who made this decision—with one exception which I will discuss in detail below. Even assuming that Keller had to lay-off some employee or employees, there is no credible evidence as to why Hammock was laid-off as opposed to another employee, particularly one who was not a "key employee." At page 9 of its brief, Respondent Keller states, "ultimately, the Charging Party was laid off at the direction of the Employer's general superintendent for lack of work," citing Aaron Suess' testimony at Tr. 314-15. The record simply does not support this assertion.

² Troeckler was a key Keller employee, as was Hammock.

Owner Dale Keller testified at Tr. 375-76 and 396 that he did not make the decision to lay-off Scott Hammock and did not know who did, Tr. 407. He testified that he did not talk to any of his superintendents about this decision, Tr. 396. Aaron Suess, a superintendent, the only management representative to testify other than Dale Keller, did not claim to have had any involvement in the decision to lay-off Scott Hammock. Suess also did not testify as to who else made this decision. Finally, if General Superintendent Thomas Caldieraro made the decision to lay-off Hammock, it defies credulity that Dale Keller would not know that. If he did not know who made the decision in August, one would expect he would conduct an investigation on this issue in preparation for this hearing.

10

15

20

5

Moreover, if Thomas Caldieraro is the person who decided to lay-off Scott Hammock, one would expect Caldieraro to explain under oath that he made this decision and explain the reasons why he laid-off Hammock as opposed to somebody else. I infer from the fact that Caldieraro did not testify, that either he was not the decision maker or that his testimony as to why he made the decision to lay-off Hammock would be adverse to Respondent Keller.

I discredit Dale Keller's testimony that he did not tell Gary Marco that the Union forced him to lay off Scott Hammock. If he did not use those precise words, I find that he said something to Marco conveying the same meaning. Moreover, I see no reason to credit the self-serving testimony of any of either of Respondents' witnesses—particularly in the absence of any testimony from Keller Construction as to who decided to lay-off Scott Hammock and why.

The out-of-court statements of Keller Superintendent Gary Marco

25

October 2013

Gary Marco in 2013 was a semi-retired project superintendent for Keller Construction. It appears that Marco worked whenever he saw fit. Respondent Keller in its answer to the complaint in this case admitted that Marco was a supervisor of Keller within the meaning of Section 2(11) of the Act and an agent of Keller within the meaning of Section 2(13) of the Act. Marco was not called by any party to testify in this case.³

35

30

Scott Hammock testified, without contradiction, to conversations with Marco. On or about October 4, 2013, Hammock encountered Marco at a bar. Marco told Hammock that "after what happened to you, I hate unions." Hammock asked Marco what he meant. Marco responded, "Keller didn't want to lay you off. No one at Keller wanted to lay you off."

³ Respondent Local 397 argues that I should draw an adverse inference against the General Counsel for its failure to subpoena Gary Marco and present his testimony at the hearing. Respondent does not cite any cases in support of this contention. If an adverse inference were to be drawn against any party due to Marco's absence from the witness stand, it would be Keller Construction. However, I do not draw an adverse inference against any party due to the fact that Gary Marco did not testify. As explained below, the testimony of Scott Hammock and Kenny Jones as to what Marco told them is the most credible evidence in the case as to why Scott Hammock's employment with Keller Construction ended on August 13, 2013. This constitutes my "valid reason for bypassing the adverse inference rule", *Metro-West Ambulance Service*, 360 NLRB No. 124, (May 30, 2014), slip opinion 3, ftn. 13, with regard to Marco.

Hammock told Marco that when he went to the union's hiring hall to sign up for referral jobs, "they acted like they were expecting me to be there." Marco replied, "Now you got it." "What those guys did to you was like Mafia." Marco continued to tell Hammock that he told Hammock's brother-in-law, Kenny Jones, what happened. Then Marco told Hammock that Dale Keller called Marco and told him not to be talking about this or he would be in deep trouble. Marco concluded by saying, "Just know that it wasn't Keller that wanted you laid off." Tr 41-42

February 2014

10

15

5

Between late January and late March 2014, Scott Hammock worked for GRP Mechanical at a site near Tulsa, Oklahoma. He was back in Illinois for a short period in early February and ran into Gary Marco again at a Sears store. Marco told Hammock that he had talked to "your investigator lady," by which I understand to be an agent of the NLRB. Marco then said to Hammock, "Dale [Keller] is just sick about this and didn't want this to happen." Hammock then asked Marco why Dale Keller did not just say what really happened. Marco responded, "He just can't, Scotty. He will have to close his doors." Tr. 68.

On cross examination, Local 397's attorney asked Hammock:

20

"Back to your conversation with Gary Marco, did he ever tell you who told him at Keller Construction, that Local 397 told them to get rid of you?"

Hammock replied:

25

"Gary said Dale Keller told him." Tr. 97.

The probative value of Gary Marco's out of court statements

30

35

Before turning to the issue of whether Marco's statements constitute hearsay evidence, the first thing to note is that neither Keller nor the Union objected to the admissibility of Scott Hammock's testimony about his conversations with Gary Marco. Assuming that Marco's statements are hearsay, they are admissible, if for no other reason, due to the lack of objection by either Keller or the Union's counsel, *Alvin J. Bart and Co.*, 236 NLRB 242 (1978). In *Alvin J. Bart* the Board explicitly rejected a *per se* rule excluding hearsay evidence from its proceedings. In *RJR Communications, Inc.*, 248 NLRB 920, 921 (1980), the Board noted that it "jealously guards its discretion to rely on hearsay testimony in the proper circumstance." As discussed below, I conclude this is just such a circumstance.

40

Are the statements hearsay?

Respondent Keller Construction admitted that Gary Marco was a statutory supervisor and agent of Keller. However, I conclude that his statements do not fall under the standards of Rule

⁴ Kenny Jones' testimony that Marco told him that Hammock's lay-off had everything to do with the union hall, Tr. 173, is also uncontradicted.

⁵ Also see *Midland Hilton & Towers*, 324 NLRB 1141 ftn. 1 (1997).

JD-35-14

801(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) that render some statements made by a party's agent to be non hearsay. It is not clear that Marco made these statements within the scope of his agency relationship with Keller. The statements were made off of work time, not on Keller's premises and certainly were not authorized by Keller. These statements, however, may not constitute hearsay under FRE rule 807. That rule does not exclude otherwise hearsay statements, not specifically covered under Rule 803 or 804 if 1) the statement has the equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness; 2) it is offered as evidence of a material fact; and 3) it is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence that the proponent can obtain through reasonable efforts; and 4) admitting it will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice. Rule 807(b) allows admission of such statements only when an adverse party is given reasonable notice of the intent to offer the statement so that a party has a fair opportunity to meet it.

5

10

15

20

Most courts treat the notice requirement flexibly so long as the opponent is given a fair opportunity to prepare to contest the use of the evidence, *United States v. Panzardi-Lespier*, 918 F. 2d 313, 3127 (lst Cir. 1990); *United States v. Calkins*, 906 F.2d 1240, 1245-46 (8th Cir. 1990). In any event, I need not decide whether Marco's statements are hearsay evidence, although I believe this to be a very close question. Assuming the statements to constitute hearsay, I rely on them in finding that both the Union and Keller Construction violated the Act with regard to Hammock's lay-off.

Assuming the Marco statements to be hearsay, I rely on them for the proposition that Keller Construction laid off Scott Hammock at the behest of the Union.

I conclude that this is a proper circumstance in which to rely on Marco's statements in determining the principal issue in this case. In addition to Marco's position as supervisor and agent of Keller, I find these statements conclusive of the fact that the Union pressured Keller to lay off Scott Hammock. I do so because there is absolutely no other explanation for the lay-off in this record.⁶ There is no evidence as to who decided to lay-off Hammock or why. In the absence of such evidence, I find Gary Marco's out of court statements dispositive.

⁶ There is considerable evidence in this record regarding Hammock's hesitancy to turn in his company truck, in the June to July 1, 2013 timeframe, all of which is irrelevant. There is no evidence that this truck incident had anything to do with Keller's decision to lay Hammock off. Moreover, I do not find the testimony of Respondent Keller Construction on this matter to be credible. It is clear that Hammock was getting conflicting instructions from two supervisors, Gary Marco and Aaron Suess, as to whether he had to surrender the truck to Suess. I do not credit Dale Keller's testimony at Tr. 366 to the extent that he suggested that he told Gary Marco that Hammock needed to surrender his truck.

Dale Keller testified that there may have been a little resistance to surrendering the truck from Marco, which supports Hammock's testimony. Then he testified that "I believe I even had to make a call to Gary and say, Gary I want the truck back at the yard." I find that he made no such call. I also find that Scott Hammock was never insubordinate with regard giving up the truck and that up to the day he returned it he was complying with the directions of his supervisor, Keller's superintendent Gary Marco, who wanted the truck to remain on his project.

Complaint paragraph 8: The Union's alleged refusal to refer Scott Hammock for employment with GRP Mechanical

GRP Mechanical is based in Bethalto, Illinois and performs a lot of work related to oil and gas pipelines. In September 2013 GRP was about to begin a job in Skiatook, Oklahoma, near Tulsa. On September 30, 2013, Richard Torres, GRP's vice-president of pipeline services and fabrication called the Local 397 union hall. Torres spoke with both Business Manager Steve Tyler and Field Representative William Traylor. Torres asked both for permission to take Scott Hammock to the GRP project in Oklahoma. Torres testified that both refused to do so.

10

5

The testimony of Torres, on the one hand, and Tyler and Traylor on the other, about these conversations differs in some respects. It is most difficult to resolve these differences because while Tyler and Traylor are not disinterested witnesses, neither is Torres. Therefore, I credit Torres' testimony only where it is not contradicted by that of Tyler and Traylor.

15

20

25

Scott Hammock worked for GRP on a construction project in 1998, but had not worked for Torres prior to late January 2014. However, Torres was familiar with Hammock in the employment context because both had worked at an ethanol plant in Illinois at the same time during the winters of 2008, 2009 and 2010. Hammock was working for Keller and Torres was the site director for a company named Abener. I therefore credit Torres' testimony that he was familiar with Hammock's work and viewed his work ethic and performance very favorably. However, Torres is also very close friends with Kenny Jones, a Local 397 member, who is also the brother of Scott Hammock's wife Donna. He has gone on an annual fishing trip with Jones on which Scott Hammock was also present. Thus, I believe that Torres was most likely very interested in assisting Scott Hammock due to his friendship with members of Hammock's family.

Torres called Traylor on or about September 30, 2013 and told him he had a project for which he needed a laborer. Traylor suggested Carey Carveiro, who had worked for GRP previously. Torres told Traylor that Carveiro did not have the skills he needed and that he 30 wanted Scott Hammock, instead. Torres testified that Traylor refused this request and suggested other laborers. Torres testified that he told Traylor that the job for which was seeking help was in Oklahoma after Traylor offered him the services of Carveiro. He further testified that 30 minutes later, Business Manager Steve Tyler called Torres and stated that if Hammock had 35 solicited work from Torres he could be brought up on internal union charges. Tyler stated further, according to Torres, that if Torres solicited Hammock, GRP could be brought up on charges. Tyler denies threatening to file charges against either. However, he concedes that he told Torres that he could not send Hammock to GRP, Tr. 468, line 22. He also concedes that he did not tell Torres that he could or should contact the Oklahoma LIUNA local to have Hammock 40 cleared for work in Oklahoma, Tr. 483.

Torres hired several laborers from LIUNA Local 338 in Wood River, Illinois for the Oklahoma project in the fall of 2013 to perform concrete work at a pipeline pumping station.

⁷ At the ethanol plant, Torres was a superintendent for another company. He has been employed by GRP since about 2011.

⁸ Tr. 208, line 12 incorrectly renders this employee's name incorrectly as Carey Caldieraro.

When he had to replace them in January, he hired Scott Hammock with the approval of LIUNA Local 107 in Tulsa.⁹

I credit the testimony of Steve Tyler and William Traylor with regard to the required procedure for taking a LIUNA member to work in a jurisdiction of another local. An employer wishing to do so must clear the employee with the local with jurisdiction over the worksite, not the local to which the employee belongs. Thus, in this case Torres should have called Local 107 in Tulsa, not Local 397. However, neither Tyler nor Traylor advised Torres that he needed to call the LIUNA local in Oklahoma. Also, LIUNA locals do on occasion assist employers in taking one of their members into the jurisdiction of another local. Dale Keller testified that he has asked for this sort of assistance from the member's local, Tr. 386, 401. Local 397 Business Manager Steve Tyler also testified that contractors have called him for assistance in taking one of his members into another jurisdiction, Tr. 420-21. He did not testify as to how he responded to such requests. However, Tanif Crotts, Assistant Business Manager of the Southwest Laborers District Council in Tulsa, a witness called by Local 397, testified that his organization does try to assist employers who want to take his members into other LIUNA jurisdictions, Tr. 501.

It is clear then that neither Tyler nor Traylor advised Torres to call Local 107 or offered him any assistance in getting Hammock cleared by Local 107. I discredit William Traylor's testimony at Tr. 541 that he heard Steve Tyler tell Torres that "you are going to have to contact Oklahoma." Neither Tyler nor Torres testified to Tyler offering such advice. Indeed, Tyler testified to the contrary, Tr. 483.

Analysis

25

5

10

15

20

When a labor organization attempts to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee due to the protected activity, including the union dissident activity of that employee, or another person, that union violates Section 8(b)(1)(A) and 8(b)(2) of the Act. When the employer discriminates on the basis on the union's discriminatory activity, the employer violates Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act. In such cases the employer and the labor organization are jointly and severally liable for remedying the discrimination, *USF Red Star, Inc.*, 330 NLRB 53 (1999). In this case I infer that the Union caused Keller Construction to lay-off Scott Hammock. I do on the basis on the out-of-court statements of Gary Marco and the absence of any other explanation for the lay-off.

35

30

The Union contends that it had no motive to retaliate against Scott Hammock because his dissident activity was inconsequential, i.e., running for a largely ceremonial union office.

⁹ Although not particularly relevant to this case, I do not credit the testimony of the Oklahoma LIUNA representatives to the extent they suggested that Torres misled them in January 2014 into believing that Hammock was already a GRP employee. I credit Torres' testimony that the Oklahoma LIUNA representatives were more than happy to let him bring Scott Hammock to Oklahoma because he was hiring 4-5 Local 107 laborers for the project, as well indicating a desire to employ additional Local 107 members in the future, See G.C. Exh. 5, Tr. 507-08. 514-15.

I regard the efforts by Local 397 to prove that GRP hired Hammock for the Oklahoma project by misrepresenting his prior work experience to be further evidence of its animus towards him stemming from his candidacy for office and his wife's letter to the International Union.

¹⁰ As in this case, the dissident activity of the discriminatee in *Red Star* was running for union office.

However, had the Jones-Hammock ticket been elected in June 2013, Mike Jones, as business manager, could have attempted to replace William Traylor as field representative, his paying job, Tr. 533.¹¹ Moreover, in a conversation with Traylor in April 2013, Hammock mentioned that one of the reasons he was running against Traylor was that he believed that the Local (Tyler and Traylor) had not treated his wife fairly. This statement, in conjunction with the letter Mrs. Hammock sent to the International Union in July, which from the union's perspective can only be characterized as vitriolic, gave the Local sufficient motive to retaliate against Scott Hammock, if it was so inclined.

Mrs. Hammock's letter was forwarded to the Union on or about July 22, 2013, just several weeks before Keller laid off her husband. It is black letter law that discrimination predicated on the protected activity of others, such as family members, is as much a violation of the Act as discrimination against the employee who engaged in union or other protected activity, *Golub Bros. Concessions*, 140 NLRB 120 (1962); *Tolly's Market, Inc.*, 183 NLRB 379 ftn. 1 (1970); *PJAX*, 307 NLRB 1201, 1203-05 (1992) enfd. 993 F. 2d 378 (3dCir. 1993). Regardless of whether the Union was motivated to retaliate by Scott Hammock's dissident activity or that of his wife, or both, I find that Local 397 violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) and 8(b) (2) of the Act.

Keller Construction violated Section 8(a)(3) and (1) cooperating with Union in its retaliation against the Charging Party. There is simply no credible alternative explanation for the lay-off in this record.¹²

I also find that the Respondent Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) as alleged in complaint paragraph 8.¹³ Although, Local 397 does not generally refer employees to jobs outside of its jurisdiction, I infer that at least on some occasions, it has assisted employers to taking its members into the jurisdiction of other locals. I have found that it did not offer such assistance to GRP Mechanical's Richard Torres and further infer that it failed to do so due to its animus towards Scott Hammock. In turn I find that this animus was due to the dissident union activity of Scott Hammock and/or his wife.

30

5

10

15

20

25

¹¹ The fact that the Union did not seek to retaliate against Mike Jones does not prove that it did not retaliate against Hammock, his brother-law and fellow dissident, *Volair Contractors*, 341 NLRB 676 ftn. 17 (2006). For one thing it may have been harder to get Jones' employer at the wastewater facility to assist in retaliation for a variety of reasons.

¹² Without citing any cases, Respondent Keller contends that the complaint should be dismissed because Hammock did not exhaust his remedies under the collective bargaining agreement. What an odd result it would be for the Charging Party to be precluded from availing himself of the Board's processes when it was his union that was primarily responsible for his termination in the first place. I suspect Respondent Keller did not cite any cases because Board caselaw is precisely the opposite, *Iron Workers Local No. 433*, 266 NLRB 154 ftn. 1 (1983); *Warehouse Employees Local 20408 (Dubovsky & Sons)*, 296 NLRB 396, 408-10 (1989).

¹³ I do not find an 8(b)(2) violation with regard to complaint paragraph 8. I do not see how the Union caused GRP to discriminate against Hammock. I would note that Hammock would not be entitled to any additional remedy for the violations alleged in complaint paragraph 8 in addition to those due him for the conduct alleged in paragraph 7.

Conclusions of Law

- 1. Respondent LIUNA Local 397 violated Sections 8(b)(1)(A) and 8(b)(2) of the Act in requesting Keller Construction to lay-off Scott Hammock on or before August 13, 2013.
- 2. Respondent LIUNA Local 397 violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) in failing to assist GRP Mechanical in employing Scott Hammock in Oklahoma.
- 3. Respondent Keller Construction, Inc., violated Section 8(a)(3) and (1) in laying off Scott Hammock at the Union's request.

Both Respondents are liable for the discriminatory lay-off of Scott Hammock. Keller Construction must offer him reinstatement and make him whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits. Backpay shall be computed in accordance with *F. W. Woolworth Co.*, 90 NLRB 289 (1950), with interest at the rate prescribed in *New Horizons for the Retarded*, 283 NLRB 1173 (1987), compounded daily as prescribed in *Kentucky River Medical Center*, 356 NLRB No. 8 (2010). Respondent LIUNA Local 397 is jointly and severally liable for Scott Hammock's loss of earnings and other benefits.

20

25

5

10

15

Respondents shall either independently or jointly shall file a report with the Social Security Administration allocating backpay to the appropriate calendar quarters. Respondents shall also compensate Scott Hammock for the adverse tax consequences, if any, of receiving one or more lump-sum backpay awards covering periods longer than 1 year, *Latino Express, Inc.*, 359 NLRB No. 44 (2012).

On these findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended¹⁴

30

Order

The Respondent, Keller Construction, Inc., Glen Carbon, Illinois its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

- 35
- 1. Cease and desist from
- (a) Discriminating against employees at the request of a labor organization which is retaliating against any employee for the dissident union activity of that employee or others;

40

(b) In any like or related manner restraining or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

¹⁴ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

JD-35-14

- 2. Respondent Keller Construction shall take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.
- (a) Respondent Keller Construction shall within 14 days from the date of the Board's Order, offer Scott Hammock full reinstatement to his former job or, if that job no longer exists, to a substantially equivalent position, without prejudice to his seniority or any other rights or privileges previously enjoyed.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

- (b) Respondent Keller Construction, Inc, shall make Scott Hammock whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits suffered as a result of the discrimination against him in the manner set forth in the remedy section of the decision.
- (c) Within 14 days after service by the Region, Keller Construction shall post its facility in Glen Carbon, Illinois copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix A." Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 14, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. In addition to physical posting of paper notices, the notices shall be distributed electronically, such as by email, posting on an intranet or an internet site, and/or other electronic means, if the Respondent customarily communicates with its employees by such means. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, the Respondent has gone out of business or closed the facility involved in these proceedings, the Respondent shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondent at any time since August 13, 2013.
- (d) Respondent Keller Construction shall preserve and, within 14 days of a request, or such additional time as the Regional Director may allow for good cause shown, provide at a reasonable place designated by the Board or its agents, all payroll records, social security payment records, timecards, personnel records and reports, and all other records, including an electronic copy of such records if stored in electronic form, necessary to analyze the amount of backpay due under the terms of this Order.
- (e) Within 21 days after service by the Region, Respondent Keller Construction shall file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondents have taken to comply.

¹⁵ If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

Respondent, Laborers International Union (LIUNA) Local 397, Edwardsville, Illinois, its officers, agents, and representatives, shall

1. Cease and desist from

5

20

25

30

35

40

- (a) Requesting that an employer terminate the employment of an employee due to the dissident union activity of that employee or any other employee;
- (b) In any like or related manner restraining or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.
 - 2. Respondent Local 397 shall take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

15 (a) Respondent Laborers International Union Local 397 shall notify Keller Construction in writing within 14 days of this Order that it has no objection to Scott Hammock's

reinstatement to his former position.

(b) Respondent Local 397 shall make Scott Hammock whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits suffered as a result of the discrimination against him in the manner set forth in the remedy section of the decision.

(c) Within 14 days after service by the Region, Local 397 shall post its offices and hiring hall in Edwardsville, Illinois copies of the attached notices marked "Appendix B." ¹⁶ Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 14, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees and members are customarily posted. In addition to physical posting of paper notices, the notices shall be distributed electronically, such as by email, posting on an intranet or an internet site, and/or other electronic means, if the Respondent customarily communicates with its employees and/or members by such means. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, the Respondent has gone out of business or closed the office involved in these proceedings, the Respondent shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all members and other persons who have signed up at the hiring hall at any time since August 13, 2013.

(d) Respondent Local 397 shall preserve and, within 14 days of a request, or such additional time as the Regional Director may allow for good cause shown, provide at a reasonable place designated by the Board or its agents, all payroll records, social

¹⁶ If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

JD-35-14

security payment records, timecards, personnel records and reports, and all other records, including an electronic copy of such records if stored in electronic form, necessary to analyze the amount of backpay due under the terms of this Order.

5 (e) Within 21 days after service by the Region, Respondent Local 397 shall file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondents have taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. June 10, 2014

10

Arthur J. Amchan Administrative Law Judge

15

APPENDIX A

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT discharge, lay-off or otherwise discriminate against you at the request of any labor organization, including Laborers International Union of North America, Local 397, when the request is motivated by the dissident union activity of you and/or any other individual.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, within 14 days from the date of this Order, offer William Scott Hammock full reinstatement to his former job or, if that job no longer exists, to a substantially equivalent position, without prejudice to his seniority or any other rights or privileges previously enjoyed.

WE WILL make William Scott Hammock whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits resulting from his lay-off/discharge, less any net interim earnings, plus interest compounded daily.

WE WILL file a report with the Social Security Administration allocating backpay to the appropriate calendar quarters.

WE WILL compensate William Scott Hammock for the adverse tax consequences, if any, of receiving one or more lump-sum backpay awards covering periods longer than 1 year.

		(Employer)	
Dated	Ву		
_	•	(Representative)	(Title)

The National Labor Relations Board is an independent Federal agency created in 1935 to enforce the National Labor Relations Act. It conducts secret-ballot elections to determine whether employees want union representation and it investigates and remedies unfair labor practices by employers and unions. To find out more about your rights under the Act and how to file a charge or election petition, you may speak confidentially to any agent with the Board's Regional Office set forth below. You may also obtain information from the Board's website: www.nlrb.gov.1222 Spruce Street, Room 8.302, Saint Louis, MO 63103-2829

(314) 539-7770, Hours: 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The Administrative Law Judge's decision can be found at www.nlrb.gov/case/14-CA-122352 or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273-1940.



THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE

THIS NOTICE MUST REMAIN POSTED FOR 60 CONSECUTIVE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF POSTING AND MUST NOT BE ALTERED, DEFACED, OR COVERED BY ANY OTHER MATERIAL. ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE OR COMPLIANCE WITH ITS PROVISIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO THE ABOVE REGIONAL OFFICE'S COMPLIANCE OFFICER, (314) 539-7780.

APPENDIX B

NOTICE TO MEMBERS

Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union Choose representatives to bargain on your behalf with your employer Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT ask any employer, including Keller Construction, Inc. to lay you off, discharge you or otherwise discriminate against you on account of the dissident union activity of you or other person. Such dissident activities include running for union office and writing letters to International officials complaining about the management of this local union.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner restrain or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL make William Scott Hammock whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits resulting from his lay-off/discharge from Keller Construction, Inc., less any net interim earnings, plus interest compounded daily.

WE WILL file a report with the Social Security Administration allocating backpay to the appropriate calendar quarters.

WE WILL compensate William Scott Hammock for the adverse tax consequences, if any, of receiving one or more lump-sum backpay awards covering periods longer than 1 year.

		(Labor Organization)		
		(Labor Organ	ization)	
Dated	By			
		(Representative)	(Title)	

The National Labor Relations Board is an independent Federal agency created in 1935 to enforce the National Labor Relations Act. It conducts secret-ballot elections to determine whether employees want union representation and it investigates and remedies unfair labor practices by employers and unions. To find out more about your rights under the Act and how to file a charge or election petition, you may speak confidentially to any agent with the Board's Regional Office set forth below. You may also obtain information from the Board's website: www.nlrb.gov.1222 Spruce Street, Room 8.302, Saint Louis, MO 63103-2829

(314) 539-7770, Hours: 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The Administrative Law Judge's decision can be found at www.nlrb.gov/case/14-CA-122352 or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273-1940.



THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE

THIS NOTICE MUST REMAIN POSTED FOR 60 CONSECUTIVE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF POSTING AND MUST NOT BE ALTERED, DEFACED, OR COVERED BY ANY OTHER MATERIAL. ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE OR COMPLIANCE WITH ITS PROVISIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO THE ABOVE REGIONAL OFFICE'S COMPLIANCE OFFICER, (314) 539-7780.